

## Chapter 1

### Ideological Becoming:

### Bakhtinian Concepts to Guide the Study of Language, Literacy, and Learning

Sarah Warshauer Freedman, University of California, Berkeley

Arnetha F. Ball, Stanford University

In his recent exhibit, "Migrations," photographer Sebastiao Salgado looks through his camera's eye to tell what he calls "a story of our times," a story of massive and global movements of people. Most often these people are migrating because they seek refuge from rural poverty or because they are refugees or displaced persons whose movements are caused by war or other political, ethnic, or religious conflict. Salgado presents haunting images of outstretched hands reaching for a new life that is just out of grasp, hungry children in parched landscapes that yield no food, masses on the move with nowhere to go. These images come from Asia, Africa, Europe and the Americas. These are not the typical media images of globalization, which associate modernity with progress and prosperity, new technologies, and high-speed travel (see Luke and Elkins, 1998, for a full description of these modern images "of our times"). We acknowledge the

typical modern images, but we also think it critical not to forget Salgado's more disturbing images, which are also images of our times.

Salgado could just as easily have fixed his lens on disturbing scenes in the United States: the hungry and homeless who migrate from shelter to street in search of spare change or a bite to eat, undernourished school children moving from home to school on unsafe streets, gangs of teenagers crossing neighborhood boundaries to mark territory and engage in seemingly senseless battles. In everyday life these scenes occur in the context of great wealth and plenty that often exists right around the corner.

It is across these 21<sup>st</sup> century divides--between the haves and the have nots, between those with place and those who are displaced, between those with access to high speed travel and technology and those who have little access, and for those at all points along these continua--that we must find ways to communicate that establish bonds rather than create barriers.

Much prior research on language, literacy, and learning has examined the nature of the divides that separate us and the clashes that occur when disparate people come together, often in our schools but in other social institutions as well (e.g., Ball, 1992, 1998; Ball & Lardner, 1997; Cazden, John, & Hymes, 1972; Cook-Gumperz, 1986; Michaels, 1982; Freedman &

Sperling, 1985; Freedman & Katz, 1987). We will use this chapter to argue for a new direction for research, one that focuses more directly on how people can and do communicate across these divides and the role such communication plays in teaching and learning. The earlier research on clashing cultures provides an important foundation for this new research agenda, for we need to know what goes wrong in order to understand what does and can go right. We argue for this new focus because more and more different kinds of people are coming together--in classrooms, in workplaces, over the internet, in cities all around the globe. New communication technologies, easier access to faster modes of travel, as well as the global migrations Salgado depicts argue for a global picture of increasingly diverse populations existing side-by-side and interacting together. Diverse people will struggle more and more to understand one another. We therefore will need to understand the nature of that struggle. We will have before us opportunities to watch what goes wrong just as we have done, but we also will have opportunities to watch and learn from effective communication as it occurs.

#### <A> Defining Ideological Becoming

We are specifically interested in understanding how effective communication leads to the development of language, literacy, and learning in these new contexts. In seeking this

understanding, we have found the theories of Mikhail Bakhtin and his whole school, including Medvedev and Voloshinov, extraordinarily helpful, especially their concept of "ideological becoming."

Before discussing why we find this concept so helpful, we will define ideology, in order to clarify what Bakhtin and his followers means by the term. According to the American Heritage Dictionary (2000), ideology means:

1. The body of ideas reflecting the social needs and aspirations of an individual, group, class, or culture.
2. A set of doctrines or beliefs that form the basis of a political, economic, or other system.

The second, more political meaning is often ascribed to Bakhtin. However, the Russian word 'ideologiya' does not carry strong political connotations. Morris (1994), who writes about British English, sees Bakhtin's meaning as most consistent with the first definition:

The Russian 'ideologiya' is less politically coloured than the English word 'ideology'. In other words, it is not necessarily a consciously held political belief system; rather it can refer in a more general sense to the way in which members of a given social group view the

world. It is in this broader sense that Bakhtin uses the term. For Bakhtin, any utterance is shot through with 'ideologiya', any speaker is automatically an 'ideolog'. (p. 249)

Emerson (1981) makes a similar but somewhat expanded point, writing from a U.S. vantage:

Its English cognate "ideology" is in some respects unfortunate, for our word suggests something inflexible and propagandistic, something politically unfree. For Bakhtin and his colleagues, it means simply an "idea system" determined socially, something that *means*. (p. 23)

In Bakhtinian writings "ideological becoming" refers to how we develop our way of viewing the world, our system of ideas, what Bakhtin calls an ideological self. Although the Bakhtinian school's concept of ideological becoming does not necessarily have a political edge, it does not exclude the development of a political idea system as part of ideological development. In the case of language and literacy learning, especially as we consider diverse populations talking and learning together, we believe that politics are an inevitable consideration. Language use and literate abilities provide ways for people to establish a social place and ways for others to judge them (see Trudgill, 1995). The choices

learners make about what types of language to acquire and use are political just as the decisions teachers make about what types of language to promote and accept in the classroom are political. Students make decisions about how much to identify with and acquire school language and school ways; they come to school with ways of talking which mark them as members of a particular socioeconomic class, and they decide whether or not to move away from those ways; they decide what to read and write and whether they care most about pleasing the teacher or their peers or both or neither. These are all broadly speaking political decisions. Likewise, teachers decide how to respond to diverse language patterns in their classrooms; how much controversy to introduce into the classroom; how to group or not group students for learning; how to respond to individuals and the group; whether to teach critically, in ways that push students to examine the established social order. Again these are all broadly speaking political decisions, some more explicitly so than others.

It is also important to note that the concept of ideological becoming does not refer to the development of isolated concepts or ideas. Bakhtin and his followers are interested in the development of the whole person and his or her complex of ideas and concepts, including political ideas but not to the exclusion of other parts of the idea system.

Bakhtin is concerned with more than individual growth, since he places the individual firmly within a social context and shows that the individual influences the social world just as the social world influences the individual.

<A> How Ideological Becoming Relates to Language, Literacy,  
and Learning

To understand the importance of ideological becoming for language, literacy, and learning in contexts where diverse people come together, we first note that according to Bakhtin/Medvedev, ideological becoming happens within what he calls "the ideological environment" (1978, p. 14).<sup>1</sup> According to Bakhtin/Medvedev, "Human consciousness does not come into contact with existence directly, but through the medium of the surrounding ideological world" (p. 14). In effect, the ideological environment—be it the classroom, the workplace, the family, or some other community gathering place—mediates a person's ideological becoming and offers opportunities that allow the development of this essential part of our being. In ideological environments characterized by a diversity of voices, we would expect new communication challenges but also

---

<sup>1</sup> The question of authorship is disputed although according to Morson (personal communication), it is now widely believed that this text was written by Medvedev. When we refer to it in the text, however, we will use Bakhtin/Medvedev since this is the authorship ascribed on the text from which we are quoting.

exciting opportunities and possibilities for expanding our understanding of the world.

Bakhtin (1981) notes that the coming together of the voices of the different individuals within these environments is essential to a person's growth: "Another's discourse performs here [in ideological becoming] no longer as information, directions, rules, models and so forth - but strives to determine the very basis of our ideological interrelations with the world, the very basis of our behavior" (p. 342). All learning is at its core social. According to Bakhtin, the social interactions that are most effective in promoting learning are those that are filled with tension and conflict. Individuals struggle with these tensions as they develop their own ideologies. Bakhtin argues that the struggles are needed for people to come to new understandings; "The importance of struggling with another's discourse, its influence in the history of an individual's coming to ideological consciousness, is enormous" (1981, p. 348). Although miscommunication of the type that has been so carefully studied inevitably occurs along the way, Bakhtin's theory implies that it is essential to look beyond the moment of miscommunication to the longer-term, ongoing dialogic process if we want to understand the struggles that lead to learning. According to Bakhtin "our ideological development is

. . . an intense struggle within us for hegemony among various available verbal and ideological points of view, approaches, directions and values" (1981, p. 346). We go through a "process of selectively assimilating the words of others"(1981, p. 341). The role of the other is critical to our development; in essence, the more choice we have of words to assimilate, the more opportunity we have to learn. In a Bakhtinian sense, with whom, in what ways, and in what contexts we interact will determine what we stand to learn.

Bakhtin (1981) argues that when diverse voices interact, we struggle to assimilate two distinct categories of discourse: (a) authoritative discourse and (b) internally persuasive discourse. Because of their different properties, we struggle with them in different ways. Bakhtin defines authoritative discourse:

The authoritative word is . . . so to speak, the word of the fathers. Its authority was already *acknowledged* in the past. It is a *prior* discourse. It is therefore not a question of choosing it among other possible discourses that are its equal. It is given [it sounds] in lofty spheres, not those of familiar contact. . . . for example, the authority of religious dogma, or of acknowledged scientific truth or of a currently fashionable book. (pp. 342-343)

The nature of our struggles with an authoritative discourse depends on our relationship with it. Bakhtin explains that literary characters often struggle against "various kinds and degrees of authority," against the "official line" (1981, p. 345); such is also the case in every day life, which art imitates. These struggles occur in what Bakhtin calls a "contact zone," that "zone of contact" where we "struggle against various kinds and degrees of authority" (1981, p. 345).<sup>2</sup> This is not to say that all people struggle against all authority or all authoritative discourses, but rather that

---

<sup>2</sup> Mary Louise Pratt (1991/1999,1992) has been widely quoted for her use of the term "contact zone"; she does not derive her use from Bakhtin but rather from linguists who talk about what occurs when different languages come into contact with one another. Contact languages refer to "improvised languages that develop among speakers of different native languages who need to communicate with each other consistently, usually in the context of trade. Such languages begin as pidgins, and are called creoles when they come to have native speakers of their own. Like the societies of the contact zone, such languages are commonly regarded as chaotic, barbarous, lacking in structure" (1992, p. 6). She uses the term more specifically than Bakhtin does "to invoke the spatial and temporal copresence of subjects previously separated by geographical and historical disjunctures, and whose trajectories now intersect" (1992, p. 7). Like Bakhtin, she is interested in "social spaces where cultures meet, clash, and grapple with each other," but she is concerned with "contexts of highly asymmetrical relations of power, such as colonialism, slavery, or their aftermaths as they are lived out in many parts of the world today" (1991/1999, p. 584). She goes on to apply the term to modern contexts where contested cultures come together and uses it to provide a contrast to the common term "community" derived from "speech community" which is often conceptualized as a homogeneous and coherent group of speakers.

there are times in our lives when what we think as an individual is not the same as some aspect of the official doctrine of our larger world. It is at those moments of struggle that we develop our own ideologies. Bakhtin explains that the struggle occurs because:

The authoritative word demands that we acknowledge it, that we make it our own; it binds us, quite independent of any power it might have to persuade us internally; we encounter it with its authority already fused to it.

(1981, p. 342)

Morson (this volume) explains that the authoritative word is not the same as the authoritarian word. The authoritative word may or may not be authoritarian. While some people take authoritarian words as authoritative, Wertsch (2002) show that some may resist. He gives the example of people living under an oppressive government who in their private discourses oppose the authoritarian words of the government, even though in public they act as though they accept these words as authoritative. The point is that it is important to determine whether what one voices as authoritative really functions authoritatively for an individual.

As we develop our idea systems or ideologies, besides struggling with the official authoritative discourses in our

---

world, we also come into contact with and struggle with the everyday discourse of the common people we encounter. This everyday discourse is what Bakhtin calls internally persuasive discourse. Internally persuasive discourse has an almost opposite set of properties to those of authoritative discourse. According to Bakhtin, internally persuasive discourse is "denied all privilege, backed by no authority at all, and is frequently not even acknowledged in society" (1981, p. 342). It is what each person thinks for himself or herself, what ultimately is persuasive to the individual. As we form our own ideas we come into contact with the discourses of others and those discourses enter our consciousness much as authoritative discourse does. The discourse of others too influences the ways we think, and contributes to forming what ultimately is internally persuasive for us. But unlike its authoritative cousin, internally persuasive discourse is subject to change and is constantly interacting with our ever-evolving ideologies. Indeed, "a variety of alien discourses enter into the struggle for influence within an individual's consciousness (just as they struggle with one another in the surrounding social reality)" (1981, p. 348).<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Landay (this volume) offers extended examples of the interplay of authoritative and internally persuasive discourse in the classroom. Morson, this volume, discusses the differences between the authoritative and the authoritarian as well as offers further examples of the

If we take the case of U.S. schools today, we can see the importance of considering learning and development in terms of ideological becoming. U.S. schools are changing demographically. Classrooms are more varied than ever before, with students coming together across what used to be considered uncrossable linguistic and cultural divides. These diverse populations bring a range of internally persuasive discourses, which will impact the process of ideological development and ideological becoming of all students inside our classrooms. They insure plentiful tensions among a range of authoritative discourses to which different students will orient and among a wide range of internally persuasive discourses as well. They also insure tensions between the authoritative discourses and the internally persuasive discourses. This rich and complex "contact zone" inside the classroom yields plentiful opportunity for students to decide what will be internally persuasive for them, and consequently for them to develop their ideologies. This diversity, which includes the diversity within the world that surrounds the classroom, presents both challenges and opportunities as teacher seek to guide their students on this developmental journey.

---

interplay of authoritative and internally persuasive discourses.

## <A> Setting a Research Agenda

As we forge a research agenda for language, literacy, and learning for the 21<sup>st</sup> century, we need to consider the multiplicity of voices in our classrooms. Furthermore, we must think globally; and we must think about language, literacy, and learning in schools and in non-school settings. In all these contexts, we need to consider how the multiplicity of voices shapes the ideologies that the next generation will develop and that will guide us all in the coming century. These voices demand that we set a research agenda that includes the complexities of our world's societies, its schools and its other settings where ideological becoming is nurtured.

We propose that if we take seriously the Bakhtinian notion of ideological becoming, there are at least three important implications for the future of research and practice:

- (a) Researchers and practitioners must take diversity seriously and see how it can be a resource.
- (b) Researchers and practitioners must seek to understand the mechanisms of growth and change, which is always occurring.
- (c) Researchers and practitioners must seek to understand peoples' struggles to creatively manage

those tensions and conflicts that are critical to learning.

We next will explain what we think it means to take these Bakhtinian concepts seriously, using our own cross-national work in the areas of language and literacy learning and teacher education.

#### <A> Our Research in Cross National Contexts

Ball will present her research in South Africa, and Freedman will present her research in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Rwanda (Freedman, Coralko et al., in press and Freedman, Kambanda et al., in press). These cross-national studies have proven especially useful in helping us broaden our assumptions about diversity, about growth and change, and about the nature of the Bakhtinian struggles and tensions that are characteristic of our new times.

Ball's study (2000a, 2000b) focuses attention on the first implication for research, what it means to take diversity seriously and see how it can become a resource. Ball's study is based on a teacher education course implemented over a three-year period in the U.S. and South Africa in an effort to help teachers become better prepared to teach culturally and linguistically diverse students. Using data collected from over one hundred U.S. and South African preservice and in-service teachers, this research investigates

the evolving perspectives of teachers as they prepare to face challenging situations in diverse schools. The data include the classroom discussions, narrative essays, journals, and autobiographies of the teachers' literacy experiences. This study shares the developing voices of these U.S. and South African teachers over time as they engage with issues of literacy and diversity in the course.

Freedman and her colleagues are studying the role of the schools in social reconstruction in two parts of the world that experienced genocides in the early 1990s: Rwanda and the former Yugoslav country of Bosnia-Herzegovina.<sup>4</sup> The study includes interviews and focus groups with educational officials as well as with local stakeholders (teachers, parents, and secondary students). The goal is to introduce

---

<sup>4</sup> Data were collected in three towns in different areas of Rwanda where the genocide was experienced differently—Kibuye and Rubengera in Kibuye province; Save in Butare province; and Byumba in Byumba province. See related studies with complementary data collected in these same cities as well as in other parts of Rwanda: Longman and Des Forges, in press; Longman and Rutagengwa, in press; Longman, Pham, and Weinstein, in press.

In the Balkans data were collected in one town in Bosnia-Herzegovina (BiH), Mostar. Additional data are being collected in Vukovar in Croatia but since they were collected later, they are not included in this chapter. Related studies with complementary data collected in these same cities as well as in other parts of BiH and Croatia include: Bilalic and Djipa, in press; Corkalo, et al, in press; Ajdukovic and Corkalo, in press; Stover, in press; Stover & Shigekane, 2002.

local voices into the national and international debates about the roles schools are playing and might play in shaping the countries' futures. Freedman describes the official debates about the schools and then provides excerpts from interviews with local stakeholders. Freedman's work focuses attention on the second and third research implications, what is involved in understanding the mechanisms of growth and change, and what is involved in understanding struggles to creatively manage the tensions and conflicts that underlie learning.

*<B> Ball's Project: Taking Diversity Seriously While Seeking to Understand the Mechanisms of Change*

Current reform movements in the US and abroad are challenging teacher education programs to prepare teachers who are able and interested in teaching in the schools of the twenty first century. U.S. demographers predict that by 2020, 46% of the US school population will be students of color while in South Africa, students of color comprise well over 50% of the school population. Reports on educational achievement in both countries confirm that a large number of these students attend schools in poor, under-resourced areas and that many of them are failing to achieve at their full potential. Many of these students move from home to school on unsafe streets. They represent society's have nots, who are often displaced, and who lack access to high-speed travel and technology. Twenty-

first century classrooms in the U.S. and South Africa are becoming more varied than ever before. With students and teachers coming together across linguistic and cultural divides, it is more imperative than ever that teacher education programs prepare teachers to work effectively with diverse student populations. Clearly, an important goal of teacher preparation programs globally must be to prepare teachers to work effectively with students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds.

Ball's interest in investigating the changing perspectives of U.S. and South African teachers emerged because these two countries share striking similarities in their need to prepare teachers to work with diverse student populations and in their histories concerning the education of marginalized people of color. These two countries have historically shared many of the same language policies toward students of color and the mechanisms they use to implement those inequitable policies. South Africa and the U.S. in past years promoted apartheid and segregation, which resulted in separate and unequal systems of education that deliberately miseducated Blacks in an attempt to lower their aspirations and prepare them for a subordinate role in society. Both countries share a history of racial disparities in the quality of schools, in educational access and in the preparation of

teachers to work with culturally and linguistically diverse students.

The cross-national study that is reported on here is based on a teacher education course that was implemented over a three-year period with teachers from these two countries as they prepared to face challenging situations in diverse schools. This course drew on the works of Vygotsky (1978), Leont'ev (1981) and Luria (1981) to build a sociocultural theoretical frame that would help to explain how teachers develop commitment to issues of diversity and how their commitments are revealed in their oral and written discourses as they consider possibilities of teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students. It was hypothesized that, as teachers were exposed to strategically designed readings and activities within a teacher education program, their perspectives on literacy and commitments to teaching diverse student populations would be affected in positive ways. Using data collected from over one hundred U.S. and South African preservice and in-service teachers, this research investigated how teachers' developing perspectives and commitments can be facilitated by exposure to the internally persuasive discourses of diverse writers about literacy and through engagement with particular classroom activities. The research reveals how the teachers' developing perspectives and

commitments are revealed in their changing patterns of discourse (Ball, 2000a, 2000b). The research involved discourse and text analyses of narrative essays, literacy autobiographies, journals, interviews, small group discussions, and videotapes of teaching collected from the teachers enrolled in the course. These data illustrate the teachers' changing ideologies concerning theoretical principles and teaching practices. In a Bakhtinian sense, this research investigates the notion of ideological becoming. Ball conceptualized the teacher education program as a learning environment and social setting—a contact zone—where ideological becoming would be nurtured. She realized that the teachers came to the course with a body of assumptions and beliefs that had been shaped by the authoritative discourses that they had encountered prior to this course. Knowing that each teacher began the course with a body of assumptions and beliefs, which constitute their internal ideologies, she exposed the teachers to a range of theoretical readings representing the internally persuasive discourses of others, which she hoped would be added to the multiplicity of voices that would shape and guide the developing ideologies of our next generation of teachers. She also exposed the teachers to readings about pedagogy and best practices that would enlighten them about working with diverse student populations

and cause them to give serious consideration to ways that diversity could be viewed as a resource in their classrooms.

The teachers in this study brought a range of internally persuasive discourses to the course, which had been influenced by the authoritative discourse that shapes traditional approaches to teaching mainstream students. The internally persuasive discourses that each teacher brought to the course impacted their ideological becoming as they engaged with new ideas within our teacher education classroom. As most teachers enter teacher education programs, they bring with them very limited perspectives on what literacy is, what it means for a person to be literate, and ways that they can strategically use the diverse language and literacy practices that students bring to the classroom as a resource. Linked to these limited views is the fact that many of these teachers have also given very little thought to teaching students who are different from themselves or who have had different literacy histories from their own. The teachers in this study were exposed to diverse readings that were carefully selected to broaden and to challenge their previously held ideologies concerning the use of literacies in classroom practice. In essence, exposure to these theoretical readings and practical strategies, coupled with reflective writing, student case

studies, and authentic teaching experiences were designed to serve as a catalyst to motivate tensions between authoritative discourses and a wide range of internally persuasive discourses that were present in our class. This rich and complex "contact zone" inside the teacher education classroom yielded plenty of opportunities for students to decide what would become internally persuasive for them; in other words, it yielded plenty of opportunities for teachers to further develop their ideologies.

As we have noted earlier, it is what each person thinks for himself or herself, what ultimately is persuasive to the individual, that determines the development of their ideologies. As teachers form our own ideas, they come into contact with the internally persuasive discourses of others and those discourses enter their consciousness much as authoritative discourse does. It was hoped that the discourses of the carefully selected theories of others would influence the ways these teachers came to think about diversity, and contribute to forming what ultimately was internally persuasive for them. According to Bakhtin, the internally persuasive discourse of these teachers would be open and subject to change and would constantly interact with other ideas in ever-evolving ways. In the account that follows, excerpts collected from one of the teacher are

presented in order to trace her changing discourses over time and to show evidence of her developing ideologies and plans for future practice. These brief excerpts are taken from the students' personal narratives, reflections on the course readings, and her discussions of how her participation in the course as a strategically designed activity system influenced her ideological becoming (see Ball, 2000a, 2000b for a more detailed description of the complex mechanisms of change that influenced this student and her fellow classmates).

One South African teacher, Dorene, was a female in her late-twenties who came from a lower-class, Black South African background. Dorene attended a teacher education program that was offered at a major university located in the Western Cape Province of South Africa. Although the university offered a traditional teacher education program, Dorene and her classmates were enrolled in a course for practicing teachers who were seeking certification in a Further Diploma in Education program. This teacher education program was designed to prepare teachers to teach in the newly emerging multilingual and multicultural schools. When she enrolled in the course, Dorene had been teaching for 3 years and living in an area of the city designated for "Blacks" during apartheid. Like all participants in the course, Dorene wrote an autobiography of her early literacy experiences in order to

bring to a metacognitive level of awareness those experiences that helped to influence the development of her ideologies concerning literacy and what it means to be a teacher. In her autobiography, Dorene revealed that she grew up in a township and recalled starting school at a rather late age:

I was then nine years old. Neither of my parents attended school, they are illiterate. But, what I vaguely remember is that my mother used to show me pictures and tell me what was going on, i.e. a woman is carrying a basket, she is coming from town, etc. What I liked best was when she told me stories, some I still remember even today. When I was about seven years old I was hospitalized and I remember the nurses used to read us stories from books in Afrikaans and English. I was in the hospital for six months and I loved to listen to what was read and also joined the other children in a class where on certain days a lady use to come and teach us to read, write and count. We also attended Sunday school and reading was done all the time there. I learned to read and write on a slate. When I could master reading in standard 3, I used to read for my mother from the schoolbook and she would sit down and listen to me. If she didn't, I used to cry.

My reflections on my experiences are both positive

and negative. Positive in the way that I developed a love for reading and school work and a love for teaching pupils the happiness and fulfillment a person gets from reading. But there were also negatives. I often thought of dropping out of school because my father did not see the importance of me going to school, not allowing me to read my books at home. The only time I could look into my books was late at night... I passed my school years having to study only at school... or else I had to wait until he is asleep. Sometimes I was beaten at school and sometimes I was beaten at home for separate reasons. I was the only one who survived...my brother and sister dropped out of school at an early age and I blame my father for that. Having someone to encourage you in what you do helps and motivates you to go further. I thank my mother and my teachers for encouraging me. I always think of my teacher who used to say "one who strives never loses' and that is how I endured my school years...

This autobiographical activity served as a readiness exercise that prepared Dorene and her fellow classmates to consider new and different perspectives, attitudes and visions for language and literacy learning, inclusion, and teaching practices in the classroom.

Following their experiences of sharing and reflecting on

their personal literacy histories, the teachers in the course were exposed to assigned readings that were carefully selected to broaden their previously held ideologies on literacy and classroom practice. They were exposed to the internally persuasive discourses of others through writings by McElroy-Johnson (1993) on *Giving Voice to the Voiceless*, Giroux (1988) on *Teachers as Transformative Intellectuals*, Freire (1994) on *The Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Gee (1989) on *Discourse as Identity*, and Delpit (1992, 2000) on *The Acquisition of Literate Discourse and on Teaching Other Peoples' Children*. In essence, exposure to these theoretical readings and to practical strategies, coupled with reflective writing and authentic teaching experiences, served as a catalyst that motivated the teachers to consider new possibilities for their teaching practices. As the teachers' metacognitive levels increased concerning their own literacy experiences, many began to look outward and to question and challenge some of their long-held perspectives that they may not have been consciously aware of earlier. After reading Giroux's (1993) thoughts on teachers as transformative intellectuals and teachers as critical thinkers, Dorene wrote in her reflective journal her critique of the educational system as she now saw it.

There are problems in our system in that firstly our

teacher training was not of equal quality and level as that of our white compatriots and because of that our teaching ways are poor because there is rote learning in our schools that does not give the time or opportunity for critical and logical thinking. I see a need for in-service training for teachers, so that teaching can be more conducive to student success and more creative so we can develop the pupils' skills in literacy in an adequate manner.

After reading excerpts from Vygotsky (1981) on the process of internalization and AU (1993) on expanding definitions of literacy, Dorene wrote the following in her reflective journal:

The theory that relates to my action research project is the one by Vygotsky that says we should internalize the activities that happen with our learners and assist them in learning more than I was as a teacher. We should not be doing the thinking for the student, but rather, we should be acknowledging the child's knowledge and make him/her more accessible to learning and not stay egocentric. I as a teacher should think, "am I transferring knowledge or am I helping to develop the child holistically in all aspects of life. I should reflect on these things myself, as I want

prosperity in my students... In addition, the five strategies from Au (1993) are very important in that a child is not encouraged to be a convergent thinker, but he/she is encouraged to use resources and embark on projects that have different topics.

As the course readings became internally persuasive for Dorene, she indicates their persuasive force as she voices what she wants for the students in her classroom:

Culturally, the learner has to identify with themselves, knowing their own language and then acquiring the ability to communicate in the other languages that are around them, thereby understanding the society they live in...The linguistic growth of students is increased when parents also see themselves as co-educators. There must develop this relationship. Schools should help to establish these collaborative relationships. Parents should be encouraged to participate in promoting their children's progress in the education of their pupils. This can be done if parents listen to their children reading books sent from home...I can truly say that I am what I am today because of my mother and I thank the Lord for having her and myself for obeying authority even under excruciating circumstances. I

now realize that these experiences helped to make me the grown up that I am: one who loves children and wants to help them in their learning...I am interested in helping small children to acquire knowledge and through it they can learn to be better persons that can work for themselves and their community, to build the children's confidence so they will not be afraid to talk even if they don't know the other languages.

After many classroom hours spent in discussions, reading about various theoretical perspectives, working with diverse students, and implementing practical strategies within their classrooms, bridges were formed between the texts they read, the teachers' internally persuasive discourses and the internally persuasive discourses of others—the diverse perspectives and the new voices that were being represented in the course. Dorene's final reflection on her expanding definition of literacy reveals her emerging thoughts about literacy and teaching in diverse classrooms. Dorene's definition of literacy evolved from one that included the ability to "read, write and speak on social context and academic context," to one that "also takes into consideration the cultural background of the students." For Dorene, the concept of literacy was greatly influenced by her reading of Au (1993). She shared

this thought in her journal: "As I have read Kathryn Au's views on the definition of literacy, I fully agreed that literacy is not just the ability to read and write but also having insight to extract meaning from a text, read with comprehension and be able to recall information. To communicate in a logical and critical way, finding out commonalities among different cultures and understanding one another, developing skills in implementing the acquired knowledge both academically and socially." From her reading of McElroy-Johnson (1993) she also included "the ability to voice out your thoughts orally" and, as she noted earlier, "having the confidence so they will not be afraid to talk even if they don't know the other languages."

These statements illustrate that, for Dorene, the course activities greatly helped her to gain the strength needed to voice her feelings and to go out and be an active agent of change for students of color in a system that desperately needs restructuring.

Dorene clearly represents a student engaged in ideological becoming as she indicates her teaching plans that have emerged as a result of the course along with the multiplicity of voices that she will need as she goes out into the system to impact change. She says: "I want as a teacher to help my pupils to

achieve their goals, i.e. reading writing and speaking. I want them to be proficient in reading all the languages we teach at school." Further evidence of Dorene's ideological becoming was heard in her emerging internally persuasive voice as she says

Now I can allow a buzz to take place in my classroom that makes the pupils feel free. I converse with them so that they may see I have an interest in their lives. As from when I started learning about the action research project, I let my pupils do activities like interviewing prominent figures in their community like policemen and nurses (projects). This way, my pupils develop confidence in speaking with professional people besides at school. I have come to the realization that in order for the teacher to be effective in the class, she needs dedication and love for what he/she does. The teacher should be supportive to the children and not have a teacher-centered class. Guiding children and being a role model helps very much when allowing the children to make their own choices. But we must make a rule that each person is responsible for his/her choice of action. Effectiveness goes with planning. Without planning properly, what are you going to do with results that end in failure? That is why it is important to assess yourself and know your goals. And finally, the tone of your voice also plays a very important

part. If you speak soft or if you scream, your pupils will imitate you.

The implementation of these changes and plans were confirmed by Ball's observation of the changes in Dorene's teaching practices over time—during her 1997 visit to South Africa and again during her 2000 visit (see Ball, in press). As we came to the close of the course, Dorene penned the following letter:

Dear Dr. Ball:

Time flew by so quickly that I was taken aback with I heard that your time in South Africa is over. I will miss you. To tell the truth you came when I was fumbling--having hard times when I said I was quitting from the course. But you came with your fire—with Vygotsky and Au flying—and you boosted my spirits. I am thankful for the help you have been, for the insights you have given. Now I know I have to be aware of every detail I venture into. In my schoolwork, I must have a far researching mind--to develop myself and ensure the progress of my pupils. I know now that for my pupils to be bilingual, I have to encourage them positively, not teaching them for the purpose of academic achievement only. But to let them adapt to all situations. Your handouts have been

a great help and will keep on helping me. Whenever I am uncertain of something and need guidance, I will take a look at my handouts. The handout on classroom-based assessment by Fred Genesee has been a great help, together with the one on how to teach a second language to first language speakers. They have been very important and will continue to be. Instructing pupils is always a challenge, but the end results of our acquired skills will be for the betterment of our students. I wish you, doctor, a safe and peaceful journey home. Please come back again soon and keep us on our toes.

Thank you again very much.

Dorene

When many of the teachers first entered Ball's course, like Dorene, they freely admitted that they had not given a great deal of conscious consideration to the notion of working as advocates for social change concerning the learning environments available for students from poor and marginalized backgrounds. During the course, teachers were confronted with the challenge of considering these issues through interpersonal and socially mediated forums, including readings representing the discourses of others, individual and shared reflections on a range of related issues, written engagement

with carefully designed prompts on these topics, and challenging classroom discussions that cause them to consider issues of diversity in different ways. Exposure to theoretical readings and practical activities took place during the course as a catalyst for engaging teachers in oral and written conversations that Ball hoped would positively impact their thoughts and developing ideologies on issues of equity and educational reform.

At the time of this research, South Africa was emerging from the systematic implementation of apartheid and a history of social, economic and educational inequalities in the education of marginalized populations. When I conducted my research in 1997 and 2000, South Africa was seeking ways to more effectively educate large numbers of poor, marginalized and underachieving students. Many of these students were from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds and they were educationally different from the students for whom the majority of instructional materials and school expectations had been tailored. At the time of my visits, it was clear that South Africa perceived the state of its educational program for underserved populations to be in crisis. With an end to official forms of social and economic segregation and degradation and an apparent need for massive reconstruction of their educational system, South African welcomed innovations

and collaborations that would support them in achieving their goals toward educational reform.

Dorene and many other students who participated in this course experienced challenges to their existing internally persuasive discourses that motivated them to struggle with the official authoritative discourses that they had encountered before. They also came into contact with and struggled with the everyday discourse of their classmates and the common people they encountered. The changes that took place as a result of these encounters are what Bakhtin and his followers call ideological becoming.

*<B> Freedman and her Colleagues' Project: Understanding Struggles to Resolve Tensions and Conflicts*

Freedman turns to the second and third implications for future research, those aspects of ideological becoming that focus on the mechanisms of growth and how learners struggle with the tensions and conflicts that lead to learning. Whereas the Bakhtinian school discusses the positive role these struggles play in learning, tension and conflict take on a special intensity in the countries where Freedman and her colleagues' research is situated: Rwanda and Bosnia-Herzegovina (BiH). These countries are in the throes of recovering from the mass atrocity of recent genocides. Many of their citizens have suffered serious trauma, and many are undergoing major shifts

in identity. They are struggling to survive their psychic and physical wounds, and they are struggling with how to understand their nationality and nationhood. They further are struggling with what democracy means for them personally and for their countries. The citizens of BiH also live under the supervision of the international community, since the United Nations Office of the High Representative enforces the implementation of the Dayton Peace Accords. Many feel that the OHR sits unrelentingly in judgment of their actions. In both Rwanda and BiH the schools carry the responsibility of inculcating ideologies in the next generation that will do nothing less than support reconciliation and a lasting peace. The stakes for the ideological becoming of the young are high and the teaching tasks complex.

In Rwanda during four months in the spring of 1994, the Hutu government organized and oversaw the slaughter, by conservative accounts, of at least a half million people (Des Forges, 1999) and by some estimates, of as many as 800,000 people (Sibomana, 1999). The current Tutsi-dominated government espouses a philosophy of national unity and reconciliation, although it was involved in massacres of up to 300,000 people in Rwanda and Congo (Prunier, 1995; Sibomana, 1999). As Sibomana (1999) assesses the situation, "Official declarations are one thing; reality is another" (p. 139). The

current Rwandan government has strongly discouraged all official identification by ethnicity and many believe it is illegal to identify as belonging to a particular ethnic group. The government also discourages even unofficial displays of ethnic identity. There is little space for disagreement or debate, and people fear retribution for any disagreement with any government policy (Longman & Rutagengwa, in press). This climate of repression creates ongoing tensions, which have few outlets for resolution. <sup>5</sup>

During the breakup of Yugoslavia between 1991 and 1995, approximately 200,000 people including 22,000 children were murdered (Maass, 1996; Open Society Institute Report, 1995 CHECK STATS HW SAYS 250,000). Whereas fear and suppression underlies the many silences found in Rwanda, unresolved anger underlies the frequent and explicit disagreements in BiH. Nationalist tensions surface on the streets, in the homes and schools, in the churches. Particularly in Serbian and Croatian areas of BiH, many politicians and their followers still seem to be fighting the war. Besides the verbal battles, violent cross-national outbreaks continue to occur periodically, with the United Nations troops stationed in the country for

---

<sup>5</sup> For detail on the political situation that led to the Rwandan genocide, for reports of the genocide, and an analysis of the current political situation, see Des Forges (1999), Prunier (1995), and Sibomana (1999).

purposes of keeping the peace. Although those who have watched the region closely over the last decade see some improvements, especially in the elected leadership, different national groups remain reluctant to take any responsibility for their role in the atrocities associated with the recent wars and tensions are far from resolved (The Human Rights Center/UC Berkeley et al., 1999).<sup>6</sup>

These international contexts force a careful consideration of how individual and social development interact with political life and of how struggle and conflict can sometimes lead to the hardening of ideas. Of particular interest in these contexts is how the official authoritative discourses in the two countries interact with the internally persuasive discourses of everyday people. The ways the discourses interact complicate Bakhtinian ideas about the role of tension and struggle in ideological becoming and suggest a relationship between ideological becoming, the mechanisms behind the management of conflict, and those processes that ultimately could lead to reconciliation (see Stover, 1998, for a discussion of the processes underlying reconciliation).

---

<sup>6</sup> For detail on the political situation that led to the genocide in the Balkans and for a full report of the genocide and an analysis of the current political situation see Glenny (2000), Maass (1996), and Silber and Little (1997).

Freedman and her colleagues' (in press) research on the schools compares the internally persuasive discourse of local stakeholders--teachers, parents, and students--with the official authoritative discourse of policy makers and education officials. In this chapter, she explores how these discourses come together ultimately to determine students' opportunities to learn. In both countries the schools play a critical role in all official plans for rebuilding the societies. In both countries people seem to place their greatest hopes on the next generation which has not directly experienced the traumatic events of the recent past and whose attitudes are not yet hardened.

There is a sense in both BiH and Rwanda that education gone wrong, contributed in powerful ways to the violence. Not only was hatred taught explicitly through the curriculum but also in Rwanda educational opportunities were systematically denied to the Tutsis by the Hutu who held power, just as the Tutsi earlier had denied opportunities to the Hutu when the Tutsi held power. Also in both cultures there was the expectation that educated people should be civilized, cultured and refined and therefore would not commit crimes against humanity or genocide. When they did, there was the widespread belief that the educational system, on a very fundamental

level, was not doing a good job. One high-ranking Rwandan education official puts forth these widely held views:

An education that leads to genocide is a terrible education as far as we're concerned . . . if someone who has a degree, the diploma, or the PhDs could go out of their way and could either kill or allow others to kill or plan to kill, that gave the feeling that that education was wrong. . . . What kind of education have I got if I have no feelings at all?

Just as the educational system was believed to have contributed to the genocide, today people believe that education, done well, could play an equally powerful role in preventing future violence. The stakes for the schools in both countries are extraordinarily high. Many players, from national and local government officials to official representatives of the international community who enforce the Dayton Peace Accords in BiH, attempt to keep tight control over what happens inside the schools. Local citizens, including teachers, parents and students, who are most affected by school policies, seldom have any forum for voicing their opinions to official decision-makers. Those who work in the schools enact the official decisions or find their ways around them; even if they do not exert official power, like families and other parts of the community, they exert

unofficial power. To use Bakhtin's terms, how local citizens' internally persuasive discourses interact and how those discourses interact with the official discourses within the country determine what actually happens in the schools. Local citizens ultimately exert a great deal of influence over the ideological becoming of the next generation, regardless of how much influence they have over school policies.

Freedman next analyzes the views of teachers, parents, and students about one tension-filled topic, the language of instruction. Both countries grapple with issues related to national languages and the languages of instruction. In both countries local citizens hold strong opinions about this issue. In both countries, these opinions relate to the state of intergroup relations and readiness for reconciliation.

Data for this study include interviews with officials and local citizens in Rwanda and in Bosnia-Herzegovina. In Rwanda during the summer of 2001 Freedman, Longman, and Samuelson interviewed 22 educational leaders, including officials from government ministries, church groups, and Non Governmental Organizations (NGOs) working on educational issues. In the fall of 2001, Freedman's team from the National University of Rwanda interviewed 84 Rwandan students, parents, and educators. Approximately half were Tutsi and half Hutu (see Freedman, Kambanda et al, in press). In Bosnia-Herzegovina

during the summer of 2000, Freedman and Leebow interviewed 33 educational leaders in Sarajevo, Mostar, and Banja Luka. In the fall of 2001, Freedman's team from the Human Rights Centers in Sarajevo and Mostar interviewed 40 stakeholders in Mostar, including students, parents, and educators.

Approximately half were Bosnian Moslems and half were Bosnian Croats (see Freedman, Coralka et al., in press).

<C> *Rwanda*. In Rwanda, the situation for communication in the schools is complicated by the fact that there are three languages of instruction—the local home language of Kinyarwanda which Rwandans learn as their native language and the academic languages of French and English, which are learned in school and are by policy the languages of instruction from the fourth year onward. French became the language of the academy and the government when the Belgians colonized Rwanda in 1919. English was introduced after the genocide by returnees from Uganda and other English speaking countries of the Diaspora. Many current government leaders, including the president, grew up speaking English. Although relatively few Rwandans are returnees who speak English as their native language, those who do have a great deal of power.<sup>7</sup> Not surprisingly, they legislated English as a third

---

<sup>7</sup> Many Tutsis were driven out of Rwanda in the early 1960s. At this time, the Hutu who are the majority group in Rwanda had gained control of the government, and the

official language for the country and as a language of instruction. This multilingual policy creates practical difficulties for the schools.

The same Rwandan education official who blamed the schools for the genocide explained the link he sees between reconciliation and language policies:

A person of my age might find it hard to forgive if the whole of your family say is wiped out and you yourself remain, but my child should grow up in a different environment. And even if they are not able to forget, they should at least have a new attitude, a new environment of peace, of reconciliation, of tolerance, of living together. It should be different from the current generation. Today some wounds are still in effect. But twenty years, ten years down the road, we think that that generation will be much better at forgiving [pause] That

---

Belgian colonialists, who had always protected the minority Tutsi population, left Rwanda and returned the country to the Rwandan people. The Tutsi who fled Rwanda in the early 1960s formed a diaspora mostly in neighboring countries and many of them organized and mounted a series of attacks to try to regain power. During these years the Hutu government in Rwanda claimed that local Tutsi were aiding the Tutsi attackers from the exterior. The Hutu government carried out a series of massacres of local Tutsi to stop their supposed support of the invading Tutsi. Part of the propaganda that led to the genocide of 1994 involved invoking Hutu fear of these Tutsi rebels from the exterior who the Hutu claimed were still being supported by local Tutsi. Currently, these Tutsi from the exterior are in

explains we also have bilingualism as a national policy because we want to use communication, you know, English, French, you know, as part of the [reconciliation] courses. Because Rwandan society, among other things, has been divided along Anglophone- Francophone lines. And what we are saying is that, how does it help you if you consider yourself Anglophone or Francophone, as a Rwandese? As a Rwandese, we have specific problems for Rwanda, and we are also together as Rwandese, never mind if your educational background was Burundi, or Congo, or Uganda, or America for that matter.

This official uses the third person and first person plural "we" as the subject of his sentences above, marking his discourse as authoritative and official; he never uses the first person to indicate that he is expressing his own opinion. When officials we interviewed wanted to express their personal opinions, they always marked a shift from speaking in their official capacity to speaking in a personal capacity with a shift to the first person pronoun, "I." Note also how after only a brief pause, this official shifts from the topic of the population's ability to forgive and reconcile after the genocide, to the topic of language policy and communication as central to the reconciliation process. As he indicates, the

---

control of the government. They returned to Rwanda in 1994,

Rwandan returnees who are in power speak either French (if they are from Congo or Burundi or some other Francophone country) or English (if they are from Uganda or Kenya or Tanzania or some other Anglophone country). Some returnees, but not all, also speak Kinyarwanda. He expresses a basic understanding that communication is essential to reconciliation, but his focus is on returnees, in his circle of government officials, who do not have the common language of Kinyarwanda. Some of these returnees are from Francophone countries ("Burundi, or Congo") and some are from Anglophone countries ("Uganda or America for that matter"). He is not talking about communication among people who were born in Rwanda and speak Kinyarwanda and those who were raised speaking Kinyarwanda when they were living abroad.

The local citizens—be they Hutu or Tutsi or teachers, parents, or students—expressed general enthusiasm for the current multilingual policy of the government. The citizens claimed that knowledge of multiple languages would be useful for travel abroad, the nation's ability to have contact with the outside world, access to a wider range of books, interactions with neighboring countries which have both French and English as their languages, opening minds to other cultures. They particularly favored the introduction of

---

stopped the genocide, and took power at that time.

English because of its status as a global language and its usefulness as Rwandans interact with the world beyond their country's borders. Given the current leadership, they also understood the necessity of adding English to stimulate better and wider communication within the country, to promote national unity, and to further future national development. The government-inspired official discourses favoring English as a third official language coincided with what in the ideal and in the abstract was internally persuasive to the local citizens.

In spite of this apparent widespread enthusiasm for English, language practices in the schools seemed slow to change. The internally persuasive discourse of the interviewees indicated definite ambivalence about introducing English as a language of instruction. Although the schools are supposed to shift the language of instruction to French and English in the fourth year, in practice many elementary schools teach only in Kinyarwanda. In some cases, they do not have staff proficient enough in either French or English to teach in those languages. When students have difficulty understanding French, some reported that teachers resorted to Kinyarwanda in order to communicate, even in the secondary schools. One Tutsi student whose family returned to Rwanda after the genocide observed: "Teachers are obliged to appeal

to Kinyarwanda when students themselves complain that they don't understand." A university official recognized, "We have Kinyarwanda as a common language. That has helped a lot as far as communication is concerned." The "contact zone" inside Rwandan secondary schools includes a far-ranging political space, with influences from Congo, Burundi, and Uganda intermixing with influences from Rwanda itself and Belgium as well as other countries that housed the Rwandan Diaspora.

French, not English, remains the preferred language of instruction for the upper grades. English is most commonly taught as a foreign language. The exception was a school with a substantial population of Anglophone students, which offered courses to these students in English and courses to the Francophone students in French. The effect was that in this school students were segregated according to language.

Some Hutu in particular resented the idea that they might be instructed in English which is a language they did not know well. As one student explained,

I started to learn in French from primary form up to now and if I were to be taught in English now it would be too difficult for me to understand what they are teaching me. So, lessons should continue being given in French because it is the language we understand and it does not give us

hard time like English would do if it is introduced as a teaching language now.

A Tutsi teacher agreed on the grounds that students have to juggle too many languages:

I think it is good to study in French because students are Rwandans. But if we used other languages, it would confuse students. . . . It is good because we also teach English as a course. . . but using many languages in teaching is difficult, because even Kinyarwanda is difficult [because some do not speak it either and it is not the language commonly used for academic talk].

A teacher Freedman's team interviewed blamed the lack of use of French in the lower grades for the difficulties he found some students to have when they reached secondary school. He gave the example of "one student who failed to adapt to French as a language of instruction." He claimed this student's difficulties "could be solved if pupils in upper primary could be taught in French to prepare them for secondary education." Another teacher stated that his "students are more familiar with Kinyarwanda than other languages" and for this reason have difficulty in secondary school. One teacher who did not speak Kinyarwanda was particularly aware of its importance for helping pupils understand their lessons at the secondary level:

As I didn't study Kinyarwanda, I have difficulties communicating with my students. For other teachers, when they meet such problems, they try to translate the message in Kinyarwanda. This is an obstacle. I try to adapt my French and English to the level of students.

Some educators also pointed out the impracticality of introducing a new language of instruction. Schools in Rwanda have difficulty paying teachers, have poor facilities, and few books or other school supplies. Furthermore, many teachers lack sufficient training. Introducing a new language of instruction was recognized to be costly in both personnel and materials:

If students are to learn in both languages, first of all, teachers must master those languages. I am silent about the lack of textbooks of both languages. So, I think using both languages now doubles the problems.

Another Hutu school administrator explained:

If they [policy-makers] want utilisation of these languages at the same rate, it requires much money. First of all, having the syllabus designed in those languages in which they want to teach, you must have qualified teachers who are able to teach in these languages. In my opinion, this is a too ambitious of an objective.

These comments make the following remarks of a government official seem naive:

Owing to the shortage of manpower, womanpower in our schools, if I move into a classroom, and I speak English, which is what I do, those who speak French will follow my lesson. Someone is doing, who speaks French only, will march into the classroom and kids who come from so-called Anglophone background could follow the lesson. It is happening, yeah.

Although this official understands the problems in resources and that bilingualism is not always a reality, he nevertheless constructed for himself and the interviewer an ideal picture of language use in the schools.

For Rwandan schools to be seen as social institutions that deal with the tensions that plague the society writ large, they must first address the issue of languages of instruction. Bakhtin and his followers show that students must interact with multiple voices, which express multiple points of view in order to learn and grow. They need a common language through which to interact and they must be able to hear clearly what others say and mean. They also must have teachers who understand and can mediate among the different voices that enter the dialogue. It may be impractical at this time to introduce English as a new language of instruction in

Rwanda; in practice many schools seem to have made the decision not to introduce English as anything more than another foreign language. It may also be the case that Kinyarwanda should be used for certain kinds of conversations; in practice many schools seem to have made the decision to use Kinyarwanda as needed. It is also the case that people in a society need to feel safe enough to express their points of view. It will be critical to have open debates about language in order to come to realistic and sensitive decisions. The same debates will be necessary in other arenas as well, particularly as people develop internally persuasive discourses to explain the recent past and as they make decisions about the future.

<C> *Bosnia-Herzegovina.* In Bosnia-Herzegovina (BiH), the tensions and struggles around the languages of instruction in the schools are just as complex as they are in Rwanda. These tensions further complicate Bakhtinian notion of how struggles lead to learning. Before the Balkan wars of the 1990s, Bosniaks (Bosnian Moslems), Bosnian Croats, and Bosnian Serbs all spoke Serbo-Croatian. Now the Bosnian Croats call their language Croatian, the Bosnian Serbs call their language Serbian, and the Bosniaks call their language Bosnian. The three languages are mutually comprehensible and have essentially the same syntactic structures; the differences are

mostly at the word level. Michael Ignatieff (1998) explains that the different groups in the former Yugoslavia tend to magnify minor differences, such as those within the languages, to achieve separatist political ends. He calls this phenomenon the narcissism of minor differences. Linguist Peter Trudgill agrees, characterizing the motivations behind magnifying these small linguistic differences as purely political, "[T]he new governments of the former Yugoslavia are attempting to stress their separate nationhoods and ethnicities by focusing on lexical differences" (p. 45).

Unlike in Rwanda, in BiH multiple official discourses are espoused by varied governments in the region, including the federal governments of the newly formed countries, varied local governments within the countries, and the international community which oversees the enforcement of the Dayton Accords. What proved internally persuasive for the local stakeholders in the interview study varied in relatively systematic ways, depending on the speakers' national group affiliation. This affiliation led the interviewees to align with different official national discourses. The project collected data in Mostar because of ongoing tensions between the Bosniaks who live on the East side of the city and the Bosnian Croats who live on the West side. While there has been improvement in recent years, people generally do not cross the

bridges that join one side of the city to the other, either literally or figuratively; however, it is more common for Bosniaks to cross to the West side than for Croats to cross to the East (Ignatieff, 2002). The schools are segregated, and the opportunities for cross-national dialogue are pitifully few for most people. Although the Dayton Peace Accords support school integration, local officials have found ways of interpreting Dayton so that schools can remain separate. Currently, in the town of Stolac, schools are integrated by having students of different nationalities go to school in the same building but not in the same classes. In some schools students are on shifts so that students from different national groups do not have to be in these so-called integrated schools at the same time. This notion of shared facilities but different curriculum and classes is now called the Stolac model. Such an interpretation of what is meant by school integration remains a point of tension between local officials and the UN's Office of the High Representative (OHR), which enforces Dayton. As one OHR representative explained:

Literally what you are talking about [with school segregation] is the fight for territory, but there is also a fight for language, identity, culture, history, heritage, and all of that. It started, again, early '99.

. . . the language, and heritage, and culture of education card has been played a lot.

In BiH the issue of language of instruction is intimately tied to issues of school integration. Since the different nationalities claim to have different languages, they claim that their children have a right to be educated in their national language. The issue has been twisted into an issue of minority language rights, which is part of a larger argument for the preservation of minority cultures. The Bosniaks are quite impatient with these arguments. In interview after interview teachers, students, and parents asserted that in reality, the language is all the same.

Officially there are unfortunately, three languages, but the thing is that we do not have interpreters. There is Bosnian, Serbian and Croatian. This is a one language . . . . damned nationalism is so strong and opposing, politics opposing although it is completely the same language. . . . No one needs an interpreter but, it is as it is.

(history teacher)

Basically, we all speak the same language. Well in the books, this making of new books, Bosnian, Croatian or Serbian. Well that is all one language - (parent)

Bosnian, Croatian, Serbian. It is the same language. Maybe it has some differences in some words, but everybody understands each other. (student)

The Bosnian Croats, by contrast, argued for their language rights, and rarely mentioned the similarities across the languages. Their internally persuasive discourses sound quite different from those of their Bosniak neighbors'. They espoused the same rights for other national groups, and claimed every group had the right to keep its language and school curriculum separate.

I think there should be national schools. So the lectures would be held in Croatian for Croat people, Serbian for Serbs and Bosniak for Bosniaks. . . . every ethnic group has to have rights. By some rules of democracy they have right to live, work and use their own language. (Bosnian Croat student)

This same student admits similarities in the languages but immediately moves on to stress the special differences that justify their separateness:

Of course all three languages don't have too many differences, but each has certain special things, and every person likes it because of something beloved in it.

Most interesting is this student's claim that she has discussed her views with students of other nationalities and that they agree with her. . "I talked about it with friends of different nationality, and they also agree." Her claim about what others think conflicts with what the Bosniaks say in their interviews

This student also voices strong views about what she feels is needed for reconciliation. She resents the foreign intervention that brokered the peace. She knows that ultimately Bosnians with different national affiliations will have to communicate with one another and find ways to cooperate, but she still holds on to her philosophy of separateness and incorrectly ascribes her philosophy to all local sides:

We have to build this country by a model and structure that is not imposed by some violent or even foreigner suggestions. I think that people of Bosnia know what's best for them . . . . Cooperation is needed in B-H, and with other countries, but it should be somehow dominant what people from here want, and for sure everyone wants their language. That is definitive.

A Bosniak parent offers a contrasting way of thinking about a mixed society. He imagines ways to preserve what he

understands to be the linguistic desires of the "others" but in a context of integrated schools and classrooms.

It [classrooms] would be mixed. It would be logical to me that everyone speaks in their own language. If the professor is Croat, let him speak in Croatian. If he is a Serb let him speak in Serb language, and the children should speak in their own languages. If by chance someone doesn't understand, he should ask what does it mean, and not to correct.

Another Bosniak teacher stresses the importance of teaching language tolerance:

If I am explaining, I had a custom to say, well, tacka and tocka [Bosnian and Croatian word for full stop, op.trans], and then said to children that both words are correct. It is nice to know both words, you know. This is a way that I am acting today . . . . Children register all of that.

When educators, students, and parents demonstrate such different and conflicting ideologies depending on their national group and when students do not have opportunities to meet in school to grapple with these differences, it creates obstacles for schools' attempts to support the kind of ideological development that could lead to mutual understanding.

<C> *Conclusion.* In both Bosnia-Herzegovina and Rwanda, Bakhtinian theories about the academic and verbal struggles that lead to learning take on an added intensity. These are parts of the world where ordinary people had little opportunity for honest verbal struggle. The situations that led to the genocides of the 1990s remain in place in too many ways for comfort. The issue of the language of instruction in the schools demonstrates how difficult it is for people to communicate honestly and work through their ongoing difficulties. As Bakhtin emphasizes, internally persuasive discourses need opportunities for testing against opposing points of view. In Rwanda, the issues are suppressed and the language of the schools often serves to depress rather than support communication. In BiH, the issues are raw and on the surface and the tensions are so great that communication is difficult. Furthermore, the schools remain segregated. In both contexts, political leaders continue to manipulate societal structures and attitudes, making it difficult for the youth to move in different directions than their parents did. In these countries, the concept of ideological becoming offers a framework for mediation, a way to consider the kinds of dialogues that could lead to change. However, the "contact zones" reference very real and very recent violent physical

conflicts, making ideological becoming all the more important and all the more complex.

In both countries, discourses work on several levels and dialogues must occur within and across these levels—from the official and authoritative words of the international community and national leaders, to the words of everyday people. Freedman and her colleagues found that everyday people are full of good will, especially given what they have experienced in the past decade and given the political contexts in which they live. The national and international leaders with their varied authoritative discourses could learn a great deal from the internally persuasive discourses of the citizens of Rwanda and BiH. The schools also could be more effective if they were to teach young people to question the authoritative discourses that seek to manipulate them and that even manipulate the schools they attend. Manipulative leaders in both countries played a major role in creating the conditions that led to the genocides. In the aftermath of the genocides, it is critically important for all sides to find ways to learn from the recent past so that mass atrocity does not occur again. In the conclusion to her book, which documents the Rwandan genocide, Allison Des Forges (1999) presents a Bakhtinian image of resonating voices of protest as what will be necessary to prevent future genocides:

We must find ways to increase the numbers and effectiveness of resisters against such crimes, whether within or outside the society at risk. We must understand how local and international protest can resonate back and forth to create the swell of outrage that will prevent or halt future genocides. (p. 771)

#### <A> A Word About Methodology

Bakhtinian theories support empirical research. They emphasize the fact that ideology is not a hidden inner process but rather is external, visible and amenable to empirical study. Bakhtin/Medvedev argues, "We are most inclined to imagine ideological creation as some inner process of understanding, comprehension, and perception, and do not notice that it in fact unfolds externally, for the eye, the ear, the hand" (p. 8). Ideology is "not in the soul, in the inner world, . . . but in the world, in sound, in gesture, in the combination of masses, lines, colors, living bodies" (p. 8). The implication for research is that ideological becoming "is completely accessible to a unified and essentially objective method of cognition and study" (p. 8). Bakhtin/Medvedev continues to explain that "Every ideological product (ideologeme) is a part of the material social reality surrounding man, an aspect of the materialized ideological horizon. Whatever a word might mean, it is first of all materially present, as a thing

uttered, written, printed, whispered, or thought. That is, it is always an objectively present part of man's social environment" (p. 8). This social environment includes the cognitive and affective worlds of the people in the society and the actions that surround them.

Bakhtinian theories support the study of social processes, not isolated individuals. Ideology is part of a social process, and can only be understood by analyzing its social and interactive essence. Bakhtin/Medvedev explain the completely social nature of the process of ideological development:

that the individual, isolated person does not create ideologies, that ideological creation and its comprehension only take place in the process of social intercourse. Each individual act in the creation of ideology is an inseparable part of social intercourse, one of its dependent components, and therefore cannot be studied apart from the whole social process that gives it its meaning" (126, in Moss from *The Formal method in literary scholarship*, 1928).

If one understands the developmental process in this way, one realizes that, "It [ideology] is not within us, but between us" (p. 8).

<A> The Development of This Book

We ourselves have gone through a process of ideological becoming in the development of this book. As scholars in the academy we began with the authoritative voices that so often dictate our perceptions and interpretations. To these, we have added the internally persuasive discourses in our worlds. These include the images of artists like Salgado as well as the images we see and the voices we hear in our daily lives—each others' discourses, our students', our colleagues', our friends' and families', our research experiences. These images and discourses push us to move beyond the comfortable topics we so often embrace to consider some of the more difficult challenges facing education—challenges such as making space in the academic agenda of schooling for the non-authoritative voices of disenfranchised students (Landay, Lee, Knoeller) and equipping teachers to think critically about their enactment of this agenda (Sperling, Greenleaf and Katz). To deal with these realities, for both teachers and students, we need what Dressman refers to as "a new map"; we need to reflect on the scholarly journeys we take, in the way that Bazerman does; we need to open our scholarly inquiry to new voices in the way that Valdés does. Only by being equipped with new ways of seeing and interpreting the discourses around us can we re-envision our future and face such challenges as those posed by new technologies (Mahiri), by adults who strive

to reshape their opportunities (Kalman), and by the next generation of what Gee calls "shape shifters" who are in the process of reinventing the world.

While we were working on this book we also incorporated the voices of a group of graduate students at Stanford and Berkeley where we co-taught a course using many of the chapters from this book. Just as we struggled with our own ideological becoming so did these students. They engaged in dialogue with a number of the chapter authors and wrote a series of "voices in dialogue" which are published at the ends of the sections to come. At many points they found themselves facing tensions between the authoritative words of the academy and their classmates' understandings of the material they were reading and interacting with.

It has now been over 25 years since Bakhtin's writings began to impact Western thought. His perspectives remain as current today as when they were first published. He teaches us that we in education have to be clear about who we are and what we think, about not just what a single individual thinks but about systems of thought and how they interact together. We have to recognize that our thought systems are always in a state of flux and growth. And we have to understand that we are responsible for an aspect of teaching that we don't always consider—nurturing and guiding ideological becoming.

## References

- Ajdukovic, D. and Corkalo, D. (in press). Trust and betrayal in war: Close interpersonal processes and implications for social reconstruction. In E. Stover and H. Weinstein (Eds.), *Justice in the balance: Rebuilding communities in Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition*. (2000) Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Au, K. (1993). An expanded definition of literacy. In Literacy instruction in multicultural settings, p. 20-34. Harcourt Brace College Publishers. New York
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). Discourse in the novel. In M. Holquist (Ed.), *The dialogic imagination: Four essays by M.M. Bakhtin*. (Translated by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M./Medvedev, P. N. (1978). *The formal method in literary scholarship: A critical introduction to sociological poetics*. (Translated by Albert J. Wehrle). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Ball, A. F. (1992). Cultural preference and the expository writing of African-American adolescents. *Written Communication*, 9(4), 501-532.

- Ball, A. F. (1998). The value of recounting narratives: Memorable learning experiences in the lives of inner-city students and teachers. *Journal of Narrative Inquiry*, 8(1), 1-30.
- Ball, A.F. (2000a). Preservice teachers' perspectives on literacy and its use in urban schools: A Vygotskian perspective on internal activity and teacher change. In C. Lee & P. Smagorinsky (Eds.), *Worlds of meaning: Vygotskian perspectives on literacy research*, pp. 314-359. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge Press.
- Ball, A.F. (2000b). Preparing teachers for diversity: Lessons learned from the U.S. and South Africa. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16, 491-509.
- Ball, A. F. (in press). *Carriers of the torch: The global challenge of multicultural education - Preparing teachers for diversity*. Teachers College Press.
- Ball, A. F. & Lardner, T. (1997). Dispositions toward literacy: Constructs of teacher knowledge and the Ann Arbor Black English case. *College Composition and Communication*, 48(4), 469-485.
- Bilalic, M, & Djipa, D. (2003). Attitudes Towards Education in Mostar. Report to the Human Rights Center, University of California, Berkeley.

- Corkalo, D., Ajdukovic, D., Weinstein, H., Stover, E., Djipa, D., & Biro M. (in press). Prospects for a New Society: Voices From the Streets of the former Yugoslavia. In E. Stover and H. Weinstein (Eds.), *Justice in the balance: Rebuilding communities in Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Delpit, L. (2000). The Silenced Dialogue: Power and pedagogy in the education of other peoples' children. *Harvard Educational Review* 58(3), 280-298.
- Delpit, L. (1992). "Acquisition of literate discourse: Bowing before the master?" *Theory Into Practice*, 31(4), 296-302.
- Des Forges, Allison, and colleagues. (1999). *Leave None to Tell the Story*. New York: Human Rights Watch. Des Forges, Alison Liebhafsky. (1999). "Leave none to tell the story": *Genocide in Rwanda*. New York and Paris: Human Rights Watch and International Federation of Human Rights.
- Emerson, C. (1981). The outer world and inner speech: Bakhtin, Vygotsky, and the internalization of language. In Gary Saul Morson (Ed.), *Bakhtin: Essays and dialogues on his work*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Freedman, S., Corkalo, D., Abazovic, D., Ajdukovic, D., Djipa, D., Leebow, B., Levy, N., Weinstein, H. (in press). Education as a tool for social reconstruction? Bosnia-Herzegovina and Croatia. In E. Stover and H. Weinstein (Eds.), *Justice in the balance: Rebuilding communities in Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Freedman, S., Kambanda, D., Mugisha, I., Mukama, E., Mukashima, I., Samuelson, B., & Weinstein, H. (in press). Confronting the past in Rwandan schools. In E. Stover and H. Weinstein (Eds.), *Justice in the balance: Rebuilding communities in Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Freedman, S., & Sperling, M. (1985). "Teacher Student Interaction in the Writing Conference: Response and Teaching," In S. Freedman (Ed.), *The Acquisition of Written Language: Response and Revision*, Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Co., 106-130.

Freedman, S., & Katz, A. (1987). "Pedagogical Interaction during the Composing Process: The Writing Conference," In A. Matsushashi (Ed.), *Writing in Real Time: Modelling Production Processes*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Co., 58-80.

Freire, P. (1994). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: The

- Continuum Publishing Company.
- Gee, J. P. (1989). What is literacy? Journal of Education, 171, 18-25.
- Giroux, H. A. (1988). Teachers as transformative intellectuals. In H. A. Giroux, H. A. Teaching as intellectual: Toward a critical pedagogy of learning. NY: Bergin and Garvey
- Glenny, Misha. (2000). *The Balkans: Nationalism, war, and the Great Powers, 1804-1999*. New York: Viking.
- The Human Rights Center/UC Berkeley, the International Human rights Law Clinic/Boalt Hall, UC Berkeley, and the Human Rights Centre/University of Sarajevo. (1999). Justice, accountability, and social reconstruction: An interview study of Bosnian judges and prosecutors. *Berkeley Journal of International Law*, 18 (1), 102-164.
- Ignatieff, Michael. (1998). *The warrior's honor: Ethnic war and the modern conscience*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Ignatieff, Michael. (October 27, 2002). "When A Bridge Is Not A Bridge." *The New York Times Magazine*, p. 56.
- Leont'ev, A. N. (1981). The problem of activity in psychology. In J. Wertsch (Ed.), *The concept of activity in Soviet psychology* (pp. 37-71) (actually from *Voprosy filosofi*, 1972, No. 9, pp. 95-108). Armonk, NY: Sharpe.

Longman, T., & Des Forges, A. (in press). Legal responses to genocide in Rwanda. In E. Stover and H. Weinstein (Eds.), *Justice in the balance: Rebuilding communities in Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Longman, T., Pham, P., & Weinstein, H. (in press). Rwandan Attitudes Towards the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda. In E. Stover and H. Weinstein (Eds.), *Justice in the balance: Rebuilding communities in Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Longman, T., & Rutagengwa, T. (in press). Memory, identity, and community in Rwanda. In E. Stover and H. Weinstein (Eds.), *Justice in the balance: Rebuilding communities in Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Luria, A. R. (1981). *Language and cognition* (J. V. Wertsch, Ed.) NY: Wiley Intersciences.

Maass, P. (1996). *Love thy neighbor: A story of war*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

McElroy-Johnson, B. (1993). Teaching and practice: Giving voice to the voiceless. *Harvard Educational Review*, 63(1), 85-104.

- Morris, Pam (Ed.). (1994). *The Bakhtin reader: Selected writings of Bakhtin, Medvedev, Voloshinov*. London: Arnold.
- OSI Report (1995).
- Pratt, Mary Louise. (1992). *Imperial eyes: Travel writing and transculturation*. London: Routledge.
- Pratt, Mary Louise. (1991/1999). Arts of the contact zone. In D. Bartholomae & A. Petrosky (Eds.), *Ways of reading: An anthology for writers*. 5<sup>th</sup> edition. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, pp. 582-596. (Originally published 1991, *Profession* 91. New York: MLA, 33-40.)
- Prunier, Gérard. (1995). *The Rwanda crisis: History of a genocide*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Salgado, Sebastiao. (2000). *Migrations*. Paris: AMAZONAS Images.
- Sibomana, André. (1999). *Hope for Rwanda: Conversations with Laure Guilbert and Hervé Deguine*. London: Pluto Press.
- Silber, Laura, & Little, Allen. (1997). *Yugoslavia: Death of a nation*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Stover, Eric. (in press). The witnesses: War crimes and the promise of justice in the Hague. In E. Stover and H. Weinstein (Eds.), *Justice in the balance: Rebuilding communities in Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Stover, Eric, & Peress, Gilles (Photographer). (1998). *The graves: Srebrenica and Vukovar*. Zurich: Scalo Verlag Ac.

Stover, Eric, & Shigekane, Rachel. (2002). *IRRC*, 84 (848), 845-865.

Trudgill, Peter. (1995). *Sociolinguistics: An introduction to language and society*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin Books.

United Nations (1948). Convention on the Punishment and Prevention of the Crime of Genocide, Article II.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes* (M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman, Eds.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.